



1 In that regard, therefore, leave or permission is **not** granted Plaintiff, and the following filings  
2 are stricken:

3 Doc. #91, "Motion for Enlargement of Time for Court's Orders/Alternatively Instruction from  
4 Attorney General to ESP Max to Remove Injurious Restrictive Restraints... ."

5 Doc. #92, "Motion/Affidavit (4<sup>th</sup>) in Support of Emergency TRO... ."

6 Doc. #95, "Motion/Affidavit (5<sup>th</sup>) in Support of Emergency TRO... ."

7 Doc. #100, "Motion to Compel Discovery/Alternatively, Reconsider Appointment of  
8 Counsel... ."

9 The court will permit the filing of and briefing on Plaintiff's two motions wherein Plaintiff  
10 seemingly seeks to secure extensions of certain deadlines relating to discovery (Doc. ## 94, 98).<sup>1</sup>

11 **Defendants shall have until November 28, 2012**, to file responses to Doc. ## 94 and 98, after which  
12 the court will conduct a status conference thereon.

13 And last, the court is in receipt of plaintiff's *Motion Opposing/Obecting to Defendant's*  
14 *Request for Extra Time (# 104) as Untimely and Court's Order (#105) Granting Improper Extention*  
15 *(sic) of Time to File Dispositive Motions* and Plaintiff's *Request for Submissions (First)*. Neither of  
16 these documents was accompanied by the necessary "letter requesting that the document be accepted  
17 for filing" as per Judge Hicks' order (Doc. # 106 at 2). Inasmuch as the "Motion Opposing/Obecting  
18 to Defendant's Request for Extra Time" is moot (per Doc. # 105) and because Plaintiff's "Request for  
19 Submission" is an unnecessary document, neither the "Motion" nor the "Request" will be accepted for  
20 filing herein.

21 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

22 DATED: November 16, 2012.

23  
24   
25 WILLIAM G. COBB  
26 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

27 <sup>1</sup> The Plaintiff is reminded to heed the instructions of Judge Hicks that any of Plaintiff's filings are to  
28 be "legible, intelligible and submitted on a single side of white paper with writing on one side of the page."  
(Doc. # 106 at 2.) Plaintiff previous filings herein are, or at least border on, being illegible and unintelligible.